DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 895 RC 009 038

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Priorities in Community Services Research for the Northeast: A Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Community Services. Publication No. 10. |
| INSTITUTION | Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development, Ithaca, N.Y. |
| REPORT NO | NRCRD-10 |
| PUB DATE | Jan 76 |
| NOTE | 63p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Southeast Regional Center for Rural Development, Cornell University, 242 Roberts Hall, Ithaca, New York 14853 (free) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage |
| DESCRIPTORS | Children; Classification; *Community Services; Elementary Secondary Education; Health; Housing; *Needs Assessment; Organizational Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Research Needs; *Research Projects; *Rural Development; Senior Citizens |
| IDENTIFIERS | *United States (Northeast) |

ABSTRACT

Constituted to include research users, the ad hoc Committee on Community Services Research in the Northeast analyzed the problems and information needs of community service personnel during a conference session. Issues and questions derived from this initial interchange were categorized and then translated into research problems. Criteria employed to determine research priorities included: (1) relevance; (2) resource availability; (3) significance of the problem area; and (4) current status of research. Highest research priorities established in reference to the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the 14 land-grant institutions in the 12-state Northeast region included: solid wastes; public housing; physical and mental preventive and long run term health care; elementary and secondary education; social services for the aging and for children. Highest priority research programs were identified as: (1) current state of knowledge: (2) analyses of alternative organizational arrangements (cost-quantity-quality relationships, cost benefit of effectiveness, distribution of burdens and benefits, citizen satisfaction and system adaptability); (3) evaluation of local, state, and national programs and policies; (4) methodologies for assessing and projecting needs for community services; (5) assessment of national needs for community services in rural areas. (JC)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development Publication 10
January 1976

ED119895

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# Priorities in Community Services Research for the Northeast:

## A Report of the ad hoc Committee on Community Services

Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

Connecticut *Delaware* Maine *Maryland* Massachusetts *New Hampshire*
*New Jersey* New York *Pennsylvania* Rhode Island *Vermont* West Virginia

KC009038

A publication of the
Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development
242 Roberts Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14853

Permission to reproduce material appearing in this publication is hereby granted for non-copyrighted use, provided full acknowledgement is made of the source and that no change of headings or text is made without approval.

# PRIORITIES IN COMMUNITY SERVICES RESEARCH FOR THE NORTHEAST--

## A REPORT OF THE ad hoc COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES

January, 1976

CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Preface | ii |
| Summary | iii |
| Part I: Definitions, Procedures and Criteria | 1 |
| Part II: Community Services Categories | 8 |
| Part III: Research Program Categories | 11 |
| Part IV: Priority Recommendations | 21 |
| Appendix A | 29 |
| Appendix B | 33 |
| Appendix C | 45 |
| Suggested Readings | 49 |

PREFACE

This report identifies those kinds of community services most in need of research findings and the types of research that are most needed in the Northeast region for these community services. This is a first of a series of reports to be submitted to the Northeast Regional Rural Development Research Program Committee. Similar reports will be developed for such research areas as land use, economic development, local government and finance, housing and processes and strategies of development. The Research Program Committee is responsible for developing a comprehensive Rural Development Research Program and submitting it to the Northeast Experiment Station Directors.

The members of the ad hoc Committee on Community Services Research in the Northeast represent a broad range of experiences. The members are:

Austin E. Bennett, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of Maine

John R. Bowles, Community Facilities Loan Division, Farmers Home Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture (Judd Hudson, Alternate)

Thomas C. Davis, Agency of Human Services, State of Vermont

Donald R. Hehn, Sussex County Extension Service, New Jersey

Samuel M. Leadley, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Pennsylvania State University

George E. Monroe, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Maryland

Dan E. Moore, Department of Rural Sociology, Cornell University

Robert O. Sinclair, Department of Resource Economics, University of Vermont

Jerome M. Stam, Economic Development Division, Economic Research Service

Harry Teter, Jr., Appalachian Regional Commission, Washington (Page Ingrahm, Alternate)

Joan W. Wright, Department of Community Services Education, Cornell University

Lee M. Day, Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development, Cornell University (Chairman)

SUMMARY

The agricultural experiment stations are justifiably proud of their contributions to improved efficiency of the agriculture production and marketing system. Yet agriculture production and marketing are not the only concerns of rural people. The well being of rural people is in no small part dependent upon the costs, quality and access to community services -- services which are not under their direct control as individual citizens.

The nature of community services is determined by group decision making and actions. Disagreements about the worth of private goods or the need to expand or reduce the production of particular commodities are in large part mediated in the market place. But comparable decisions about community services are more complex, more value laden, and surrounded with great uncertainties and frustrations. Contrast the information available to a citizen who is about to make a decision regarding a choice of crop variety or a level of fertilization with that available to one who is about to vote on a bond issue or the consolidation of two local school systems. Is a bigger system really better? In terms of costs? In terms of quality? In terms of responsiveness to the needs of a local community? Answers to these and other questions have immediate application to issues in a large variety of community services ranging from human services such as a health clinic to largely physical services such as a solid waste disposal system. Both declining and expanding rural communities face these issues in an environment of increasing fiscal pressures amidst a mixture of relative private affluence and public poverty.

The committee recognizes the need for an expanded program of research in community services. This report identifies community services having high priority needs for research efforts and priority types of research on those services in the Northeast region for the next five years.

The Northeast region includes Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont and West Virginia. The report relates to research by the U. S. Department of Agriculture and the 14 land-grant institutions within the region.

From among over 60 community services[1/], those with the highest priority research needs are identified as:

-- solid wastes
-- public housing
-- preventive health care (physical and mental health)
-- long term health care (physical and mental health)
-- elementary and secondary public education
-- social services for the aging
-- social services for children

---

[1/] See Appendix B for a listing of the services considered, definitions and example organizations providing each service.

Community services identified as having high priority needs for research are identified as:

-- sewage and drainage
-- land-use controls
-- public transportation for people
-- information and referral
-- diagnostic treatment - outpatient health services
-- social services for the handicapped

Community services identified as having medium priority needs for research are identified as:

-- land transportation for both people and goods
-- planning
-- adult education
-- pre-school education
-- vocational training and retraining

Five kinds of research programs on those community services have highest priority:

-- current state of knowledge
-- analyses of alternative organizational arrangements including studies of cost-quantity-quality relationships, cost benefit or effectiveness, the distribution of burdens and benefits, citizen satisfaction and system adaptability
-- evaluation of local state and national programs and policies
-- methodologies for assessing and projecting needs for community services
-- assessment of national needs for community services in rural areas

The committee attempted to assess the comparative advantage of the State Agricultural Experiment Stations, the Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development and the Economic Research Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture conducting these high priority types of research. While each research organization can make valuable contributions, it is suggested that the total research program could proceed most effectively if:

-- the Experiment Stations emphasize studies of alternative organizational arrangements for the delivery of community services and methodological studies for assessing and projecting local needs for services

-- the Economic Research Service emphasizes the evaluation of state and national programs and policies, the assessment of national needs for community services and state-of-knowledge research

-- the Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development emphasizes state-of-knowledge research

The Committee notes the complexity of analyses of alternative organizational arrangements and makes some suggestions regarding a possible approach. See pp. 12-21, 28 and Appendix C (p. 45).

Community Services Research for the Northeast--A Report
of the ad hoc Committee on Community Services
Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development

PART I: DEFINITIONS, PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA

This report is a supplement to the Task Force report, Rural Development Research in the Northeast for the Next Five Years--A Framework, September 1973. The Task Force was established by the Northeast Regional Agricultural Research Planning Committee, a joint State Agricultural Experiment Station - U. S. Department of Agriculture body, to identify high priority rural development research. The Task Force identified the three high priority areas: land-use, community services and economic development; three intermediate priority problem areas: local government and finance, housing and processes and strategies; and two areas of lower priority: human resources and environmental quality.

The Task Force did not try to be specific about the kinds of research that might be undertaken within these priority areas, nor did it attempt to select particular research projects or to say specifically how the research should be undertaken. Rather, among its recommendations for organizing rural development research in the Northeast, the Task Force proposed that the Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development (NERCRD) give continuing attention to problem identification, priorities and program planning and organization for rural development research. The Northeast State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors and the U. S. Department of Agriculture have requested NERCRD to implement this Task Force recommendation.

As a first response to this request, the Center has established an ad hoc committee on community services research. Comparable ad hoc committees will be formed for other priority problem areas. The Center has also established a continuing committee, the Northeast Regional Rural Development Research Program Committee, to prepare the recommendations for an overall program of rural development research for the region. These recommendations will be submitted to research administrators and investigators in the State Agricultural Experiment Stations and in the U. S. Department of Agriculture. The recommendations will probably be reviewed and updated periodically.

Thus this report is a continuation of the Task Force report and is an attempt to add specificity, particularly in the area of community services research. It is also a significant part of a continuing effort by researchers and research administrators to develop an improved program of rural development research in the Northeast region.

## Definitions and Scope of Considerations

The Committee accepts all of the definitions proposed in the Task Force report. The definitions of rural, rural development research and community were among those definitions especially relevant to the task of this committee.

Rural

The term rural is used in this report in a general sense and is broader than either "rural" or "non-metropolitan," as defined in the 1970 census of population. The term rural in this report includes all population not classified as urban metropolitan. Thus, it includes all residences in non-metropolitan (SMSA) areas, and the rural residences of metropolitan areas where rural refers to farms, open countryside and towns of less than 2500 people and non-metropolitan refers to places outside of counties containing cities of 50,000 or more population. Using this definition, approximately 3 out of 10 residences in the Northeast region are a potential clientele for rural development programs and accordingly for rural development research. The secondary beneficiaries of such research, those in urban areas, may, of course, greatly outnumber the primary beneficiaries.

Rural Development Research

The Committee accepts the definition that rural development research is limited to an investigation of those activities that people undertake as groups to improve rural communities. The Committee recognized that actions taken by individuals in the private sector--increasing the intensity of farm operations or introducing a new technology into a processing plant--may contribute to the purposes of rural development. Nevertheless, these activities are not considered as rural development activities and the research of such activities is not considered as rural development research. To do otherwise would bring nearly all of social and economic activities under the umbrella of rural development and rural development research. Thus, rural development research is limited to public or group decision making actions.

Community

A community is defined as a local area united by economic, social or political ties. For some purposes it may be a village, for others, a multi-county unit.

Community Services

The committee took two approaches to the definition of community services, definition by concept and definition by example. First a public service was conceptualized as one that meets at least one of three conditions:

1. Jointness of supply (That is, consumption of the service or goods does not preclude its consumption by others--the lighthouse is a classic example.)

2. The existence of external effects that accrue to other persons or communities and for which it is infeasible to compensate either by subsidization or taxation

3. Production of the good or service by decreasing cost industry such as generally thought to be the case with public utilities

Clearly such "services" as pollution of the air, land or water could meet the second condition of external effects for which it may be infeasible to compensate either by subsidization or taxation and it would thus qualify as a public service. For purposes of this report we attach a side condition or addition to the definition that the service must be perceived as having a positive value. Thus the act of polluting the air, land or water would not be considered a public service but group activities to control or mitigate the air, land or water pollution would be considered as a public service. Thus, conceptually a community service is a public service (i.e., at least one of the three conditions stated above is met), that is perceived as having some positive value, and is a service about which groups or communities make collective decisions. These decisions may take the form of either control decisions (controls over the actions of private individuals or firms), financial or production decisions.

Clearly, such a definition is subject to difficulties of interpretation. We start with a definition of public services. A bus service would meet the condition of jointness of supply (use of the service does not preclude its use by others) up to the point that the bus is full. Is it a public service as long as the bus is not full and a private service after the bus becomes full? Attempts to apply the definition reveal questions of extent or degree rather than simple dichotomies. There are very few "pure" public services, or, for that matter, very few "pure" private services. The distinction between private services and community services is best thought of as a continuum between ideal private and ideal public services. Nevertheless, we hope the definition of a community service as a public service that meets at least one of the three conditions of a public service and a service perceived as having some positive value, and about which groups or communities make collective decisions will provide some conceptual guide to the identification of community services.

The Committee's second attempt at definition was by example. Included as community services were such services as acute health care services, adult education, courts, diagnostic health services, parks and recreation, preventive health services, police protection, public school education, roads and highways, sewage systems, solid waste disposal and water systems. For a complete listing of services considered by the Committee see Appendix A.

## Committee Procedures

The membership of the Committee was consciously constituted to include a broad range of experiences, particularly a number of users of research--CRD extension agents, state specialists and federal and regional agency staff. Working under the presumption that research planning is often undertaken without the benefit of input from users of research, the major part of the first two day conference was devoted to asking users about the critical issues as they see them; the kinds of questions they faced in their work; research and other informational aids that they wished they had when faced with problems.

Following is a sample of the issues, questions and comments that may give some flavor of the kinds of discussion that took place.

1. Solid waste disposal. It is literally impossible to comply with regulations.

2. Regionalization of services. Regionalization of police is in progress. State planning of health services is not working very well. With respect to schools, it was said we couldn't afford small schools but now we have no local control, higher costs and less quality.

3. How does a community cope with changes in size and characteristics of clientele populations? For example, what if the number of school children drops by 25 to 50 percent?

4. We don't have effective mechanisms for citizen participation. How do we get objective information to citizens? Special interest groups provide selective information.

5. How do we determine the need in rural areas for various types of rural service? Do we ask, the mayor, for example? What standards do we use in delineating need?

6. What are the appropriate modern forms of financing for communities? How do we assure that loans get repaid? Who pays, who benefits? Do we use revenue bonds or general obligation or some combination of the two? Some services can use a service, or user charge.

7. How do we project community growth? Does growth always indicate more services?

8. Is it possible to separate community services from land-use and economic development?

9. How do we define quality education? (I have never seen educators and parents further apart.)

10. How do we carefully define needs? How do we measure them?

11. We should focus some research on a coordinated research extension experiment so that we get information that will actually be used. Research and action should continually interact.

12. We need research on implications of local versus state decision making. Is the higher level more desirable, more efficient?

13. The essential need is to improve the decision making process so that expert information is balanced by local input.

14. Too many communities solve their money problems only by losing their ability to direct the process.

15. The first problem is with the concept of community itself. Communities are changing and too often government bodies are not representative of a community. What difference does the nature of the community make for decision making regarding community services?

16. Where are the elderly going to live?

17. How do we make the political process representative of all constituencies, e.g., the young?

The latter part of the first conference session dealt with an attempt to categorize the issues and questions raised by the users and to translate these questions to research problems or research programs.

A strategy of committee operation began to emerge. If we could develop a categorization scheme for research problems and, similarly, a categorization scheme for community services, then we could arrange these categories of services and research problems into a table and relative priorities could be assigned to each cell within the table. For example, we could prepare a table with the columns having such headings as assessment of need, distribution of costs and benefits, economies of size as indicators of kinds of research programs and the columns could be examples of community services, such as preventive health, primary and secondary education and sewer services. Our job would then be to establish a priority for every intersection of a row and column in the table. This, was perhaps too ambitious and objective but it did serve as a conceptual guide for the committee. The second two day conference was devoted almost entirely to attempts to develop a system of research problem categories.

## Criteria

The criteria for judgments for priority of both services and research programs was the expected usefulness: relevance, significance of the problem area, resource availability and current status of research. It is presumed that all of the research considered by the Committee meets the additional criteria researchability and applicability--criteria suggested by the Task Force report. The criteria used by this Committee are meant to be expansions of and additions to the significance and relevance criteria which were also used by the Task Force.

### Relevance

Relevance to public problems is a judgment that the research results should have impact on public decisions and actions. Relevance is considered to consist of two elements: the probability of influencing the decision of public decision making bodies and the expected scope and magnitude of the direct and indirect impact of potential solutions in affecting the quality of rural life. Thus, one could think of the magnitude of potential impact being weighted by the probability of impact. Clearly a research area that is expected to have a large impact and a high probability of impact would be a prime candidate for high priority, as judged by this criteria. Timeliness of research vis-a-vis decisions is an essential element of the probability of impact. Researchers

and research administrators often reallocate research resources in response to the timeliness criterion, e.g., the response to the Southern corn-leaf blight outbreak by corn breeders. The difficult task is to judge what is likely to be timely three to five years from now, because research undertaken now will be judged timely then.

Significance of the Problem Area

This criterion is a restatement of the significance criterion used by the Task Force, together with some modification of the concept for special application to community services research. This Committee agrees with the Task Force that,[1]

> There are two principal ways to look at this. One is the expressed concern of people caught up in problem situations and of government officials, extension workers, and other individuals trying to work with people in finding solutions. Such concerns ordinarily are specific and immediate, e.g., the need for better jobs, lack of medical services, or conflicts arising from incompatible use of land. The second way to identify significant problems for research is to look behind the expressed concerns to detect underlying questions, that if answered would help to resolve the concerns. For example, the need for jobs in this particular area leads to questions about economic development which in turn calls for knowledge about growth processes at work in the region, community characteristics favorable or unfavorable to growth, and so on. Taking this approach, the researcher may identify a significant research problem that relates to concern of rural people but is cast in different terms.

The element of public expenditures was added to the significance criterion of the Task Force. Thus, research on a community service that consumes a high proportion of public expenditures in rural areas would have priority over research on public service that takes only a small proportion of the total of the public expenditures.

Resource Availability

Resource availability refers to both fiscal support and to appropriate personnel. The issues raised by the research users and the research program categories developed by the Committee are most appropriate for the social scientists. In many instances, however, assistance from other disciplines within the university would be desirable. It is presumed that in most instances resources can be found within the land-grant university. The scope of research needs considered by the Committee is far beyond the fiscal resources now avail-

---

[1] Rural Development Research in the Northeast for the Next Five Years--A Framework, Task Force report to the Northeast Regional Agricultural Research Planning Committee, September 1973, p. 9.

able to the region. Researchers and research administrators will need to be alert to new sources of funds and to innovative means of managing "soft" and "hard" monies to get maximum research output.

Current Status of Research

The current status of research, both nationally and in the region, was given special attention because members of the Committee who were research users were asked to raise issues about what research information was lacking. CRIS reports on community services research were also reviewed. The Committee noted, for example, that a large number of economy-of-size studies have been undertaken. Almost without exception, however, these studies have a very narrow orientation, with size usually measured by a single variable such as population, with quality of service usually ignored and no attention given to consumer satisfactions.

## Part II

## COMMUNITY SERVICES CATEGORIES

The Committee developed a system of categories for both community services and research programs. The system was needed because of the difficulty of establishing relative priorities for community services research and establishing some degree of order in the variety of community services and in the variety of types of research projects that might provide useful information about those services.

The Committee divided the set of community services into three categories: physical services, physical-people services and people services. Physical services were defined as those services that typically have a heavier orientation toward facilities with little personal interaction between the producer and the consumer. Sewer and water systems are examples. Physical-people services generally involve more intensive personal contact than is typical of physical services but less intensive personal contact between consumers and producers then is typical of people services. Police and fire protection systems are examples. People services use facilities, but the service typically involves very close interaction between the producer and the consumer of the service. Health and educational services are examples.

A brief outline of the services considered by the Committee is shown below. Because each category and sub-category is relatively self explanatory, the outline will not be elaborated upon here. For a complete listing and description of the content of each point in the outline see Appendix B.[1]

I. Physical Services
   A. Utilities
      1. Water
      2. Power
      3. Sewage and drainage
      4. Communication
      5. Solid wastes

   B. Roads, streets and frontage improvements
      1. Streets and highways
      2. Lighting
      3. Traffic control

   C. Housing
      1. Zoning
      2. Building permits

---

[1] The classification and definition of services used in this report is adapted from Inventory of Social Services for the Stockton Metropolitan Area by McCalla, Couchois, and Hackett for the Center for Community Development, University of California, Davis, Extension, February 1970.

3. Housing inspection
4. Public housing
5. Redevelopment

D. Other physical services
1. Landscaping
2. Flood control
3. Pest control

II. Physical-People Services
A. Public safety
1. Police
2. General public safety
3. Fire
4. Courts
5. Correctional programs for adults
6. Correctional programs for youth
7. Legal aid

B. Planning
1. Development and redevelopment
2. Planning

C. Environmental and other regulations
1. Non-residential building inspection
2. Land-use control
3. Pollution control

D. Parks and recreation
1. Parks
2. General recreation
3. Youth recreation

E. Transportation
1. Air
(a) people
(b) goods
2. Land
(a) people
(b) goods
3. Water
(a) people
(b) goods

III. People Services
A. Information and referral

B. Health, physical and mental
1. Preventive
2. Diagnostic treatment - out patient
3. Acute care
4. Long term care

C. General education services
   1. Pre-school
   2. Elementary and secondary public education
   3. College
   4. Adult education
   5. Library

D. Special educational services
   1. Special education for children
   2. Special education for adults

E. Employment services
   1. Vocational training and retraining
   2. Vocational rehabilitation
   3. Placement services
   4. Testing and counseling
   5. Job development
   6. Regulation

F. Social Services
   1. Income supplements
   2. Services for the aging
   3. Services for family and adults
   4. Services for children
   5. Services for handicapped

G. Citizenship and Voting

## Part III

## RESEARCH PROGRAM CATEGORIES

The Committee organized community services research into five major categories.

1. Current state of knowledge
2. Alternative organizational arrangements
3. Evaluation (emphasizing evaluation of local projects and national policies)
4. Methodological studies (with emphasis on projecting local needs and on assessing national needs for community services)
5. National needs assessment for community services in rural areas

To a common understanding of the content of the program categories, each category will be discussed in detail.

### Current State of Knowledge Research

This type of research is described by the Task Force report as Type 1 research. It is the inventorying, synthesizing, and interpreting of past knowledge. Such knowledge is the results of past research, known trends in economic and social data, experience of other communities in dealing with similar problems, sources of assistance in planning and implementing programs, applicable economic and sociological principles, and other matters. Decisions are constantly being made at local levels about community service matters on which much useful information exists in diverse and widely scattered sources, but decision makers and offices of research and extension workers are not adequately aware of this information. The state of knowledge studies could collect and interpret this information for a wide audience of decision makers, research and extension workers. While this kind of activity is not traditionally called research, it can be very useful.

### Alternative Organizational Arrangements*

The technology of service delivery, combined with both the decline and growth of rural communities, is raising serious questions about the most appropriate organization of service-delivery systems. A number of prescriptions are available for improving service-delivery systems. Some promote specialization, probably on efficiency grounds; others promote integration of services, also on efficiency grounds; still others propose regionalization or consolidation as a means of improving service-delivery systems. There is a considerable lack of information about these and other alternative prescriptions. In the Committee's judgment there is a high payoff in research examining the relationships between variations in organizational arrangements and service delivery outcomes. The program of research in alternative organizational arrangements will be discussed under two major headings:

*researchers particularly interested in studies of alternative organizational arrangements are referred to Appendix C.

1. Delineating alternative organizational structures

2. Evaluation of the results of alternative organizational arrangements

Delineating Alternative Organizational Arrangements

In discussing alternative arrangements it is necessary to specify the dimensions along which organizations may vary. The Committee suggests a number of relevant dimensions: the scope of services rendered, the scale and form of service production and control, the form of linkages between production and control units, the methods of financing and the mechanisms for citizen input.

1. The Scope of Services Rendered. In many instances an organizational structure produces only a single service, e.g., sewage treatment and disposal, water supply, fire prevention, or elementary education. In other instances, a particular organization may produce a combination of services, e.g., the fire department may provide ambulance services and safety education, and the elementary school may provide some preventive health services. The structure of the organization producing services is, in part, a function of the services produced. Clearly the separation or consolidation of these services would be an alternative organizational arrangement.

2. The Scale and Form of Service Production and Control. Control units are defined as the primary policy-making unit analogous to the corporation or the board of directors of the corporation in the private economy, while production units are analogous to the plant in the corporation. For example, the educational control unit may be a school district, and the school board is the mechanism for policy decisions. The school district may serve a single village, township, combination of townships, an entire county or a multi-county area. The production organization may consist of many small schools (plants) or fewer large-scale schools. Differences in the scale of control unit and the organization of production units are considered as alternative organizational arrangements.

3. The Form of Service Production and Control. Organizations vary in their decision making structures, e.g., their organization charts, boundary, scope and procedural rules or their voting or aggregation rules. Variations in these rules for either production or control may result in alternative organizational arrangements.

4. Linkages between Units of Production and Control. Differences in the linkages between units of production and control, between control units or between production units are another source of variation in the structure of delivery systems. For example, a multi-township school district might operate a centralized transportation system; individual schools within the system might be given the responsibility for designing and operating the transportation system; or the transportation activity might be contracted to private firms to organize and operate.

5. Methods of Financing. Financing methods may include special property taxes or assessments; local, state or federal income taxes, revenue or obligation bond issues and standardized or sliding scale user fees. In some instances the method of financing may require particular organizational structures, e.g., linkages between control units. In other instances the method of finance may be associated with particular outcomes, e.g., a greater likelihood that those who benefit from the service are those who pay.

6. Mechanisms for Citizen Input. Some organizations may make extensive efforts to gain citizen participation. These may take the form of citizen advisory boards, extensive interaction with civic organizations and formal surveys. It is hypothesized that the extent and kind of effort to obtain citizen input may significantly affect some of the outcomes of community services, particularly citizen satisfaction with the services rendered.

It is clear that with so many factors identified as determinants of the type of organization, a very large number of alternative arrangements could be identified. Two related questions arise: 1) If available resources do not permit the analysis of all alternative organizational arrangements, which ones should be analyzed? 2) Can some of the possible alternative organizational arrangements be pooled for purposes of either a part of or the entire analysis? The Committee suggests that two criteria might be useful in answering the first question: 1) the frequency of occurrence of an existing organizational arrangement, and 2) the kinds of alternative arrangements that are being offered as solutions to problems associated with existing arrangements. The first implies knowledge of the variety and frequency distribution of alternative arrangements. If this knowledge is not available it would become the first step in the research process.

The answer to the second question (can some of the alternative arrangements be pooled for analytic purposes) is really a question of the significance of the differences in arrangements. If two or more alternative arrangements are judged to have the same outcomes, they can be pooled. But, how do we assess sameness or difference in outcomes? The committee suggests that the hypotheses of differences be in several dimensions including efficiency, equity, system adaptability and citizen satisfaction.*

If, for example, it is known, or thought to be known that specific differences in methods of financing have no effect on efficiency, equity, system adaptability or citizen satisfaction with the delivery of the service, then arrangements that differ only in methods of financing can be pooled. The more likely event, how-

---

*Briefly, efficiency refers to the relation between inputs and outputs of the system; equity refers to the distribution of costs and benefits and degree of access to the service; system adaptability refers to the ability of the system to adapt to changes in the community and its relation to other communities; and citizen satisfaction refers to the extent to which a community service meets the expectations of the citizenry. A more complete discussion of these concepts is presented later in this report.

ever, is that alternative arrangements cannot be pooled for all parts of the analysis. Thus, one set of observations may be pooled into one analysis unit for studies dealing with efficiency and other sets of observations are pooled for studies of equity, and still other sets are pooled for studies of citizen satisfaction. In these instances the estimation of outcomes in the several dimensions for a specific organizational arrangement would be derived from observation units not limited to the overlapping subsets.

In the case of cross sectional statistical analysis, differences in organizational arrangements could be described by dummy variables. The coefficients of intercept and slope shifter variables would provide direct estimates of the effect of alternative organizational arrangements on such dependent variables as costs or citizen satisfactions and the tests of significance for these coefficients would also serve as a guide to pooling decisions.

The Committee suggests four criteria for the evaluation of alternative organizational arrangements: efficiency, equity, consumer satisfaction and systemic adaptability. In this section attention will be given to two types of studies relating to the efficiency criterion and one type of study relating to each of the other criteria.

The Committee notes the need for evaluation among the five specific kinds of studies if decision makers are to have the data they need to analyze the tradeoffs in selecting an organizational arrangement.

## Cost, Quantity, Quality Relationships

The Committee notes considerable dissatisfaction with cost studies that relate costs of a service to the population contained in the geographic area served. It believes more attention should be given to the measures of the quantity of output and that commensurate attention should also be given to measurements of quality of the output. Cost or efficiency studies that mix or confound the effect on costs of differences in quantity with differences in quality can provide misleading information to decision makers.

Assembly or transportation costs are not always borne by the organization delivering the service, yet decision makers need estimates of total costs as well as that portion of the costs borne by the organization. The service is often not a single transaction but a series of transactions, not always in the same location. The analysis of cost-quantity-quality relations should involve assembly, in-plant and follow-through costs. In community services, particularly integrated services, single measures of output are seldom sufficient. This is not simply a matter of plotting variable, fixed and total cost against some single measure of output such as, for a fire department, the appraised value of residential property protected. Fire departments protect single family dwellings, high-rise apartments, industrial and commercial properties. It is suggested that researchers give serious consideration to multiple measures of output.

The Committee also has serious doubts about the feasibility of single measures of quality. Individual citizens and communities have different views as to what constitutes quality community service. In protective services such as police and fire, the density of population distribution may have considerable influence on the quality of service delivered. Such measures as the response time or the percent of population served within ten minutes of response time, between 10 and 19 minutes, etc., which in turn may be related to the number and distribution of fire or police stations may be important indicators of quality. Thus the Committee sees studies of cost relationships not as simple curves or functions but rather as complex functions where total costs are a sum of transportation or assembly costs and in-plant cost functions and where either transportation costs or plant costs or both are a function of multiple measures of output, multiple measures of quality, the nature of the production function (including the kind of technology), factor prices, and such spatial characteristics as density of population.

Cost functions may be either short term (plant and associated technology fixed) or long term (plant and associated technology variable). Long-run cost functions can be derived directly from cross sectional data or indirectly from a range of short-run cost functions which in turn may be estimated by cross sectional or budgeting technique. Probably the long range cost or planning functions will be of greater interest, especially to those communities considering the effects of substantial change in population and hence changes in service demands or regionalization of services. Such cost functions, particularly when combined with locational models (including separable programming type spatial equilibrium models), can be used to examine the cost effects of alternative sizes and locations of plants. Such information should be a part of the information required to answer such questions as, "Are there alternative organizational structures which would provide the same quantity and quality of output at a lower cost?"

Benefit-cost or Cost-effectiveness Analysis

Benefit-cost analysis, the ratio of dollar benefits to dollar costs, is often used to determine the feasibility of major projects such as flood control or drainage projects. Projects should have a benefit cost ratio greater than 1.0 and a project with a higher benefit-cost ratio, other things equal, presumably has higher priority. Cost-effectiveness analysis is an offshoot of benefit-cost analysis where part of the output (effects) of an undertaking cannot be measured in dollar terms and, hence, cannot be combined into single-benefit cost ratio.

Cost-benefit (effectiveness) analysis can be used to help communities make decisions about priorities of expenditures for alternative service systems, e.g., improved solid-waste disposal versus improved fire protection. They can also be used to evaluate alternative organizational structures for performing a particular service by bringing together all the costs and all the effects, including those that were not captured in the cost-quantity-quality analysis.

Research users should be cautioned, however, about naive uses of benefit-cost or cost-effectiveness analysis. Communities like individual citizens have a multiplicity of goals, some of which are more highly prized than others. The analysis should make explicit the effects on specific goals, but it cannot tell the community which goal is most prized. Thus, benefit-cost or cost effectiveness is merely one input into the community decision making process about priorities.

Studies of the Distribution of Burdens and Benefits from a Given Service

Here we are concerned with questions of equity. Who benefits from the service and what is their access to the delivery system? Are there differences in access, availability and quality in terms of the characteristics of consumers? The other side of the coin is how do costs for services relate to levels of income, age, race, sex and geographic location of recipients? How does the distribution of burdens and benefits from a community service vary with alternative organizational arrangements for funding the service? In the public sector, if costs are met by some form of taxation, the incidence of tax on different segments of the population is of great importance.

The equity problem must be examined because it includes some of the more important problems in rural development in the delivery of community services. Many studies show rural areas to be disadvantaged when measured by any yardstick of equity.

System Adaptability

The kinds and quantities of community services that are desired may change with shifts in the nature and extent of needs and problems, with changes in social preferences and values, with changes in the environmental conditions with which services must cope, and with changes in the available technology.

There are a number of conceptual frameworks that might be useful in analyzing system flexibility or openness to change. Systems theory and communication theory are two of these. Communications theory posits that the characteristics of information and the characteristics of the media or channels by which information is transmitted are particularly relevant to systemic adaptability. The characteristics of information include its interpretability to various interest groups (consumers, practitioners, controllers); its clarity about the ends and means of services; its timeliness vis-a-vis the information needs of interest groups; its accuracy and currency as to the operations and outcomes of the system; and its accuracy and currency as to the environment of the system.

Characteristics of the channels or media for information transmittal may include the precision of linkage between the system and its environment capable of carrying information; the provision of communication linkages between all system components; the capacity of these linkages for multi-directionality; the existence of centralized information "clearinghouses" as well as a decentralized network; the existence of technology for transmitting current information in relatively undistorted form; and the existence of network roles.

Researchers should also analyze the effects of different incentives on adaptation. What is the effect of state or federal laws, citizen pressure, or professional peer groups?

### Citizen Satisfaction

One criterion for judging alternative organizational arrangements should be the degree to which citizens are satisfied. The notion of citizen satisfaction is complex. Each citizen makes his own analysis of cost-quality-quantity-equity relationships. Community services are not designed with a single individual in mind, but, rather, a larger population. The procedures by which individual preferences or demands are combined to reach public decisions is an important study in itself. These procedures or decision rules are based on some implicit criterion or valued outcome such as minimum level of satisfaction for everyone, highest average level of satisfaction, and so forth. The actual techniques for expressing dissatisfaction include voting, hearings, opinion surveys, demonstrations, and even violent acts.

The relationships among these various ways of assessing satisfaction or dissatisfaction should be analyzed in evaluating the overall delivery of services.

## Evaluation Research

### Evaluation of Local Projects

In addition to state of knowledge studies, and descriptions and analyses of alternative organizational arrangements, evaluation studies of local projects are needed. Evaluation research examines the history of specific applications of community service systems; for example, the installation of a municipal water system, building a community center and implementing programs in it or establishing a regional planning commission. Evaluation research provides an opportunity for making use of experience when decisions are made about community services.

Evaluation studies include:

1. a description of the situation, organizational structure, staff and activities
2. an elaboration of stated and implied purposes
3. a description of inputs made
4. an enumeration of results and consequences
5. an analysis of the relationship of the results to objectives, of inputs to service and of impact on the community

Evaluation studies vary in their intensity of measurement along the hierarchy that ranges from description of inputs, through clientele participation, clientele reaction, quantity of service, quality of service and impact on clients,

to the impact on the total community. A study costs more in time and money as it measures higher levels of the hierarchy. More studies are needed, at all levels, of more community services. Experiment stations probably should engage only in research at the higher levels of the hierarchy, including discovery of procedures for determining community impact.

Attention should be given to keeping evaluative research projects manageable in size and clear as to what is being evaluated. For example, in a study of a community swimming pool, the number of people using the pool in a given area is direct and controllable. But trying to determine the overall impact of the swimming pool on the health of the local community as a secondary benefit is much more difficult. Preference should be given to projects identified by the community as necessary to assist in local decision making on public policy or on public spending questions.

### Evaluation of State and National Policies

The magnitude of expenditures on state and national policies warrants a different and more intensive approach to evaluation. In recent years, pilot or experimental projects have been funded by the federal government under the assumption that experience with the pilot projects would play a major role in determining whether or not the program should be expanded to a national scale. Evaluation of such projects offers scientists an opportunity to have significant impact on the shaping of state and national programs and policies.

In these instances, evaluation research borrows considerably from conventional experimental work with before, after, and control group measurements made and compared with alternative program provisions. Emphasis would be placed at the higher levels of the hierarchy referred to above. Thus, an evaluation of a congregate meals for the elderly program might include not only the effects of different program provisions on the number of clients served, but also the effects on nutritional levels, perceived physical health and physical health as measured by such standards as decline in nutritionally related diseases or improved tests of blood or urine. Such evaluation might also include effects on the social-psychological health as measured by such concepts as social interaction or sense of belonging. Such detailed evaluations might be desirable for local programs as well as for state and national programs and policies, but the distinction between the two levels of evaluation studies is made for a practical reason. With limited research resources, the more inclusive and expensive evaluations should be reserved for state and national programs and policies, where the magnitude of prospective program expenditures and program benefits would be expected to be greater.

## Methodological Studies

### In Assessing Local Needs

Planning for community service programs is dependent on estimates of future needs and use. The development of most community services requires considerable lead time and significant community and outside resources. The

identification of improved techniques for projecting community service requirements can assist communities in their choices for providing such services.

Research should be directed toward the development of data collection and analysis procedures for estimating future community service requirements in local and regional areas. To the extent possible, these improved methodologies should use, but not be limited to, existing data sources such as the census. Research efforts might explore both highly sophisticated projection techniques and improved techniques in use at the local level. Clearly this involves more than population projections. It also involves the relation between the size and makeup of the population and service requirements of various kinds.

As part of this effort, research that reviews and analyzes past projection efforts should be supported.

## Assessing National Needs for Community Services in Rural Areas

Legislators at both the state and national level need information to identify gaps in the community services area on the rural scene. There are a variety of concepts of need for community services:

1. Normative needs (standards defined by experts)

2. Felt needs (wants not always conditioned by costs or availability of resources)

3. Expressed needs or pressure points (as indicated by waiting lists for housing services, time required to gain a doctor's appointment, etc.)

4. Comparative need (discrepancy between service availability and use in Community A and Community B is a comparative need in Community B)

The Committee questions the comparative advantage of using academic resources to identify and quantify felt or expressed needs. To the extent that such concepts of need are useful, they can be better identified and measured by people on the local scene. We do, however, see the advisability of using academic resources for the identification and measurement of normative and comparative needs. The research problem would be to:

1. Establish a normative need or set of standards by consultation with experts e.g., adults of specific age brackets should receive one complete physical per year and minor check-ups two times per year. It could be established that each of these requires X amounts of physician's time. The total population of this clientele would require X number of physicians to deliver this service. This is compared to Y number of physicians currently available.

2. Establish the rates of use of specific services by such characteristics as age, sex, education, income; by type of community--urban suburban, or rural.

3. Compare the actual use of specific services among the different types of communities and the normative standard. Standards set by experts are not inviolate; comparative need is an alternative measure. Comparative need for rural communities would be estimated by comparing actual use with predicted use where predicted use is based on existing usage rates for urban communities with the appropriate adjustments for differences in such characteristics as age, sex, and education. Normative need for rural areas would be estimated by comparing actual use with use rates judged by experts as desirable rates.

It is suggested that small scale pilot projects be initiated to test alternative instruments for collecting such data, to trace out the practicality of the implications of normative versus comparative need concepts, and to obtain estimates of the cost of collecting such information on a national scale.

## Assessment of Community Service Needs in Rural America

The rationale for assessing the community service needs in rural areas has been presented in the previous section. The Committee chose to distinguish between methodological studies of need assessment and the actual assessment of community service needs in rural areas, largely because of the magnitude of research resources that would need to be devoted to a national assessment of community services needs. It is suggested that such research would provide useful information relative to the projection of the rate of use in specific communities where the past rates of use of community services have been limited by the availability of such services.

## Part IV

## PRIORITY RECOMMENDATIONS

It was noted earlier in this report that the Committee's deliberations were guided by a strategy of placing community service categories and subcategories in rows and research program categories and subcategories in columns to form a table. The Committee would then attempt to place priorities on each cell of the table. With a table of 60 rows (community service sub-categories) and 5 columns (considering only the research program categories without consideration of subcategories of research) for a total of 300 cells within the matrix, the task of placing priorities on individual cells would indeed be a formidable one.

The Committee considered the strategy of reducing the complexity of priority setting by considering only major categories of services such as physical, physical-people, and people services; or at the next level, utilities, highways and roads, public safety and planning. It was concluded that establishing priorities at these levels of aggregation would be meaningless. The Committee amended the strategy to establish priorities in the rows and then in the columns. Considering the resources available to the region, perhaps only those cells represented by high priority rows and high priority columns would be considered high priority research.

The columns of the table also represent some unique problems. Some subcategories of research programs, for example, the category of alternative organizational structure with subcategories of costs-quantity-quality relationships, cost-benefit-effectiveness studies, distribution of burdens and benefits, system adaptability and measures of consumer satisfactions, were not sufficiently independent to be considered separately. Thus, in this particular instance, the program category should be considered as a whole. In other program categories, the subcategories were sufficiently independent so that an appraisal of priorities at the subcategory level was appropriate, e.g., methodological studies of projecting the local demands for services and in assessing national needs for community services. This in and of itself would not constitute a problem. In fact, considering the alternative organizational structure as an aggregate would reduce the number of cells within the matrix, and, therefore, would make the setting of priorities more comprehensible.

Any satisfaction with even minor simplification, however, was short lived. If a specific research activity was considered as having high priority, would it be considered high priority for all research organizations? Or, were there particular organizations that had a unique advantage in one or more kinds of research? It was agreed that particular organizations did have unique capabilities for particular kinds of research, and, therefore, that priorities for specific research activity should not be considered independent of research organizations. It was also readily agreed that the relevant research organizations for consideration by this Committee were Agriculture Experiment Stations operating either individually or in combination of two or more states, the Economic Research Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, and the Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development.

The question of priority relative to magnitude of resources was also raised. If specific research was high priority for a small amount of resources, would it also be high priority for a large amount of resources? No precise definition of "large" or "small" was developed, but it is clear that the resources required for studies of alternative organizational arrangements and for the national assessment of community service needs in rural areas would be large both in terms of the number of disciplines involved and in terms of the magnitude of scientific manpower and financial support. It is clear, also, that the methodological studies of projecting needs for community services in local areas and methodological studies in assessing national needs for community services are a much smaller undertaking. Evaluation studies, particularly of local projects are currently being carried out largely by the Cooperative Extension Service in the various states, and, hence, represent very little expenditure of resources from Experiment Station, Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development, or Economic Research Service. Evaluation of state and national programs and policies probably requires a resource commitment somewhere between the "small" amount of resource required for methodological or state-of-knowledge studies and the "large" amounts required for studies of alternative organizational structure and the national assessment of needs for community services in rural areas.

The Committee agreed that the question of establishing cell priorities in a table of 60 rows and 7 columns*, when combined with the questions of priority for whom and for how much resources, was incomprehensible. Thus, the strategy developed was to establish priorities of services based on the criteria discussed earlier in this section, and then to address the question of who should conduct the research, taking into account the additional criteria of resources required and unique capabilities of specific organizations.

## Priorities for Community Service Categories

The Committee implemented the strategy outlined in the previous section by rating each service category as high, medium or low, and assigning a score of three, two or one, respectively. The resulting scores were arrayed and divided into four levels: highest, high, medium or low priority. The results are presented in Table 1 below. For a more complete definition of the categories, see Appendix A.

---

*The seven columns represent the 7 categories and subcategories of research programs: 1) current states of knowledge; 2) alternative organizational structures; 3) evaluation of local projects; 4) evaluation of state and national programs and policies; 5) methodological studies in projecting local needs; 6) methodological studies in assessing national needs and 7) national needs assessment.

Table 1

Priority Recommendations of Service Categories

| Identification (in Appendix A) | Community Service | Priority Rating |
|---|---|---|
| I-a-5 | Solid Waste | highest |
| I-c-4 | Public Housing | highest |
| III-b-1 | Preventive Health Care | highest |
| III-b-2 | Long-term Health Care | highest |
| III-c-2 | Elementary and Secondary Public Education | highest |
| III-f-2 | Social Services for the Aging | highest |
| III-f-4 | Social Services for Children | highest |
| I-a-3 | Sewage and Drainage | high |
| II-c-2 | Land-use Control | high |
| II-e-2-a | Public Transportation for People | high |
| III-a | Information and Referral | high |
| III-b-2 | Diagnostic and Treatment Health Services | high |
| III-f-5 | Social Services for the Handicapped | high |
| II-e-2 | Land Transportation Services (for both goods and people) | medium |
| II-b-2 | Planning | medium |
| III-c-4 III-f-4 | Adult Education | medium |
| III-c-1 III-f-1 | Pre-school Education | medium |
| III-e-1 III-h-1 | Vocational Training and Re-training | medium |
| all others | | low |

The Committee recognizes that a number of service categories in Table 1, such as public housing, land-use control and public transportation systems may be a part of the assignment for future ad hoc committees. This Committee feels no jurisdictional rights with respect to these topics. They are simply presented as interim information to researchers and research administrators.

## Priorities for Research Programs by Organizations

It is not the intention of the Committee to recommend that any particular organization refrain from conducting a specific kind of research. Rather, the Committee approach was to consider the resource requirements of each kind

of research and to consider the unique capabilities of the relevant research organizations--the Experiment Stations acting singly or in combination, the Economic Research Service of the U.S.D.A., and the Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development.

Studies of the Current Status of Knowledge

This kind of research could be organized in a variety of ways. For example, studies could be organized around categories or subcategories of research programs, such as cost-quantity-quality relationships or evaluation research, regardless of the application to specific services. Alternatively, studies could be organized around specific services such as preventive health care, or special attention could be given to such program categories as alternative organizational structures and evaluation research.

The Committee has no unique insights as to how such studies would be best organized but suggests that this be determined to a large extent by the interests and skills of personnel available. This type of study is viewed not as a team effort but as a series of one-person efforts that requires dedication by experienced researchers. It is suggested that the kind of activity is not particularly suited to the usual joint appointment of Experiment Station researchers where teaching, extension or committee duties could disrupt and delay the progress of the work. The Committee suggests that the Economic Research Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture and the Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development have a comparative advantage for this type of research activity.

Alternative Organizational Arrangements

Studies in this category, emphasizing, of course, the highest priority community services, are large scale undertakings in terms of the magnitude of resources required, the variety of disciplines that need to be involved and the variety of alternative organizational arrangements that need to be investigated. The Committee recommends that the Experiment Stations, because of the variety of social sciences and other disciplines available to them in the colleges of the land-grant university, have a comparative advantage for studies of alternative organizational structure. Clearly, the magnitude of resources required for studying even the highest priority community services is so large as to indicate a need for cooperative work involving two or more stations and for outside funding. Outside funding will necessitate innovative management of resources so that contract deadlines can be met.

Evaluation Research

Evaluation of local projects is now undertaken largely by the Cooperative Extension Service in the various states. The Committee sees no reason for recommending a change. There are instances, however, where both the evaluation activity and the relations between research and extension and between

research and action agencies in the state could benefit from greater involvement by research personnel, largely in a consulting role, in the evaluation activity.

It might appear that the state program and policies should be evaluated by the individual experiment stations and national programs and policies by the Economic Research Service. Decisions as to who should do what are, however, not always that simple. State programs sometimes become national programs or influence the shaping of national programs and policies. Ostensibly, state programs are often financed with federal monies. Research organizations such as the Economic Research Service are often involved in essentially state activities, and contribute considerably to that research and to an intelligence function at the national level regarding problems and possible solutions of those problems in the various states.

The Committee sees merit in cooperative arrangements between the Experiment Stations and the Economic Research Service and other agencies in the federal government in the conduct of evaluation research. Consideration of the magnitude of funds going into programs related to community services gives this kind of research a high priority.*

Research on Methodologies for Assessing and Projecting Local Needs

Overbuilt or underbuilt facilities for community services are expensive monuments to erroneous public decisions. The Committee is conscious of the reluctance of researchers to project into the future. But local decision makers must look into the future and they need help. Decisions have to be made, be they based on good projections or bad projections. It is suggested that this kind of activity be given a high priority, for a relatively small amount of resources, by Experiment Stations. Perhaps a demographer working with an economic developer (both on a part-time basis), working with data from the entire region, could accomplish this task.

Assessment of National Needs

It is the recommendation of the Committee that both the methodological studies and the actual assessment of community service needs in rural areas are appropriate activities for the Economic Research Service. We see

---

*The reader might ask what is the difference between evaluative research of state and national programs and that research aimed at assessing the effects of alternative organizational arrangements. Clearly, they are partially overlapping sets. Not all alternative organizational arrangements for providing community services are the result of state and national program and policies. But state and federal governments do sometimes foster the development of alternative organizational arrangements and evaluation of these efforts to develop new arrangements would be considerably complimented by empirical research on costs, effectiveness and consumer satisfaction with existing organizational arrangements.

many advantages to having the responsibility for the methodological studies resting with the organization that would conduct the national assessment. Clearly, the assessment has to be coordinated at a national level if results are to serve as a useful guide to future Congressional action.

## Summary of Recommendations Regarding Research Programs

The recommendations of the Committee regarding the comparative advantage of the Experiment Stations either individually or in combination, the Economic Research Service, and the Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development in the conduct of specific kinds of research are summarized in Table 2 below. An "H" represents a high-comparative advantage, an "M" represents a medium-comparative advantage and an "L" represents a low-comparative advantage.

Table 2

Comparative Advantage of Research Organizations
With Respect to Research Program Categories

| Research Programs | Research Organizations | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Experiment Stations | Economic Research Service | NERCRD |
| States of Knowledge | L | H | H |
| Alternative Organizational Arrangements | H | M | L |
| Evaluation: | | | |
| Local Projects | L | L | L |
| State and National Programs and Policies | M to H | H | L |
| Methodological Studies-- | | | |
| of Assessing and Projecting Local Needs | H | L | L |
| of Assessing National Needs | L | H | L |
| National Assessment of Community Service Needs in Rural Areas | L | H | L |

As indicated in Table 2, the Committee suggests that the Agricultural Experiment Stations have their greatest comparative advantage in studies of alternative organizational arrangement and methodological studies for assess-

ing and projecting local community service needs. The latter require, however, a more limited amount of resources. Following closely in terms of comparative advantage are evaluation of state and national programs and policies that require resources on a scale approaching the analyses of alternative organizational arrangements.

The Economic Research Service, and more particularly, its Economic Development Division (EDD), as might be expected, has a high comparative advantage in a number of areas; current states of knowledge studies, evaluation of state and national programs and policies, methodological studies of community service needs in rural areas, and the actual conduct of national needs assessment studies. The resource requirements for two of these--the current studies of states of knowledge and methodological studies are, however, quite low relative to the resources available to the EDD. For example, one or two persons working on states-of-knowledge studies in any particular point in time would be consistent with the high priority rating. The Committee sees no real alternative to ERS in the conduct of national-needs-assessment studies. We are also hopeful that the Economic Research Service, particularly through its employees stationed in the field, can make valuable contributions to studies of alternative organizational arrangements.

The Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development is judged to have its greatest comparative advantage in the conduct of states of knowledge studies. By making arrangements with experienced researchers who are due for sabbatical leave or can obtain leaves without pay, the Center can insure that the researchers are away from their home environment and associated disruptions, so that work on these projects can proceed effectively. The low comparative-advantage ratings on other research programs does not mean that the Center cannot make a valuable contribution in these areas. It is expected that the Center will facilitate the development of proposals for studies of alternative organizational structure and for the evaluation of national programs and policies and that it will assist in the search for outside funding via either contracts or grants.

## A Note on Multi-Disciplinary Research with Special Reference to Studies of Alternative Organizational Structure

The Committee members are especially concerned about coordination of research activities among the various disciplines. Too often multi-disciplinary research sinks to the lowest common denominator, e.g., the sociologists feel constrained to doing only those things that economists understand and agree on and vice versa. Yet, complete independence of efforts by the researchers of the various disciplines is indefensible in that it can result in one discipline analyzing one set of alternative arrangements and another discipline analyzing still another set of organizational structures, perhaps even a set producing a different service. The result would be a wasteful lack of additivity of the findings of the various efforts. We suggest that at a minimum, multi-disciplinary research teams should be assembled that can agree to analyze, first, a particular service or set of services; second, a particular set of alternative organizational structures; and third, a particular sample of control and producing units within an organizational structure. Within this extent of agreement, there is ample room for specialization and cooperation among the disciplines on such outcomes of alternative organizational arrangements as cost-quantity-quality relationships, system adaptability, citizen satisfaction and the distribution of costs and benefits.

## ad hoc Committee on Community Services Research for a Northeast Regional Rural Development Research Program

### Background

Community Services research was one of the high priority problem areas identified for rural development research throughout the Northeast in the Task Force report Rural Development Research in the Northeast for the Next Five Years -- A Framework. This report is sometimes referred to as the Bird-Brandow report. The Task Force was set up by the Northeast Regional Agricultural Research Planning Committee, a joint state agricultural experiment station - U. S. Department of Agriculture body.

The Task Force did not attempt to select particular research projects nor to say specifically how the research should be undertaken. Rather, among its recommendations for organizing for rural development research in the Northeast, the Task Force proposed that the Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development (NERCRD) give continuing attention to problem identification, priorities, program planning and organization for rural development research. The Northeast State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors and the U. S. Department of Agriculture have requested the NERCRD to implement this Task Force recommendation.

As a first response to the request, the Center is establishing an ad hoc Committee on Community Services Research. Comparable ad hoc Committees will be formed for other priority problem areas. It is anticipated that the Center will also establish a continuing committee, the Northeast Regional Rural Development Research Program Committee, to prepare recommendations for an overall program of rural development research for the region. The recommendations for a regional program will be submitted for consideration of research administrators and investigators in the State Agricultural Experiment Stations and in the U. S. Department of Agriculture. The expectation is that the recommendations will be reviewed and updated periodically.

In addition to investigators, the membership of each ad hoc Committee will include representatives of research users, in keeping with the spirit of the recommendations in the Task Force report.

### The Charge

The general purpose of the ad hoc Committee on Community Services Research is to make recommendations for a program of needed research for the Northeast in the area of community services. Such recommendations are intended to provide a focus and a specificity for this area of rural development research which was not possible in the Task Force report. Recommendations are desired for a research program covering the next 5 years.

The community services area is roughly - but not entirely - analagous to what economists call public goods or services. Many - but not all - community services are provided through government or some form of group action. Many of the services are provided by way of public decisions rather than in a market. The community services area includes but is not limited to health services and facilities, social welfare services, educational services, transportation systems for people, solid waste disposal, sewage disposal, water for domestic and industrial use, police and fire protection, and recreational services.

Some of the on-going public programs mandated to provide financial or other assistance in the area of rural community services use operating definitions which are much broader than the definition of rural used in the 1970 U. S. Census of Population. The Census definition includes as "rural" the people living on farms, in the countryside, and in centers of less than 2,500 people. The Committee should give special attention to community service research needs for rural areas as defined by the Census. However, to be responsive to the knowledge needs of operating programs which use a broader definition of "rural", the Committee should not exclude consideration of community services research in non-metropolitan places defined as those outside the urban centers of 50,000 or more.

Specific Functions

1) To identify the community services which should receive highest priority for research.

2) To identify the aspects of the selected community services which should receive the greatest attention.

3) To identify specific research questions which meet the criteria of significance, researchability, and relevance to group decisions and action.

4) To suggest the relative priority for the research questions (perhaps by such groupings as high, medium and low), taking into account such factors as (a) the state of current knowledge, (b) knowledge needs for policy and program purposes, (c) when the knowledge is needed and the time likely to be needed to produce the knowledge by research, (d) potential benefits and their distribution among classes of beneficiaries, (e) availability of researchers competent for the tasks required, and (f) availability of funds.

5) To suggest whether each question requires new research or whether the needed knowledge might be provided by retrieving, synthesizing, and interpreting useful information which already exists in sources such as past research, available data on social and economic trends, and experiences in dealing with similar problems.

6) To suggest, in each instance, whether the research question could be most appropriately attacked, for example:

   (a) By the initiation of a new regional research project by investigators within the State Agricultural Experiment Stations;

   (b) By the initiation of state research projects within one or more of the State Agricultural Experiment Stations or the 1890 land-grant institutions;

   (c) By a research unit of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, e.g., the Economic Research Service or the Agricultural Research Service;

(d) By the Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development;

(e) By a federal research agency outside of the U. S. Department of Agriculture;

(f) By some other public or private research agency;

(g) Or, by some combination of the above.

5) If best researched as a regional research project or with regional input: (a) suggest a tentative list of investigators who might be interested in being invited by the appropriate body of the Northeast State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors to prepare a regional project proposal or to take a new tack under an existing regional project; and (b) prepare a preliminary estimate of the Scientist Man Years (SMY's) required to conduct the research and a preliminary estimate of the monetary requirements exclusive of SMY's.

Suggested Guides for Committee Operations

It is recognized that establishing priorities is a difficult and somewhat arbitrary process. Some research may be high priority for small amounts of effort but low priority for large scale undertakings. Conversely other research may not be worth initiation unless funded at a high level. But some judgments on priorities are sorely needed.

The proposed program should reflect the present and future needs of rural people for community services and should reflect a goal of access to these services roughly comparable to that enjoyed by urban citizens. Although the primary concern is with the welfare of rural people, as defined, this does not preclude a study of an entire service delivery system.

The Committee need not feel unduly constrained in its program recommendations by the financial resources in sight at this time. Nevertheless, funds will not be unlimited and this fact will be reflected in the relative priority ratings assigned the different segments of the research program.

Among the issues which the Committee should consider in identifying specific research questions are: (1) perceived needs for community services to serve rural people generally and different categories of rural people such as the elderly, (2) the costs and effectiveness of alternative methods for providing services, e.g., public, private, or a combination of public and private, (3) alternative methods of increasing access to services, (4) alternative methods of financing service delivery systems, (5) the organization and location of services, (6) the appropriate services in different kinds of communities, (7) the quality of services, and (8) the processes and strategies for bringing about changes with respect to community services. This is not meant to be an exhaustive list.

The first audience for the recommendations of the Committee will be investigators and research administrators who decide on what research to undertake and what projects to support. However, the purpose of the research is to provide information which will be useful to policy-makers and program administrators, in both the public and private sectors, and to citizens generally in making wise decisions as to community service systems for rural people of the region.

The Committee may wish to go beyond its own membership in seeking information which will assist in the development of its recommended program of community services research.

## Resources Available to the Committee

The Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development will endeavor to provide the Committee with the support which it may feel is needed to complete its assignment; e.g. consultants on specific topics.

## Relation to Other Committees

The recommendations of the Community Services Research Committee will be submitted to the Center's Northeast Regional Rural Development Research Program Committee which will also be receiving, reviewing, and evaluating the recommendations of the *ad hoc* committees for other high priority problem areas. The *ad hoc* Committee reports will be the basis for the Research Program Committee's proposing an overall program of rural development research which the Center will submit to the Northeast State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors and to research administrators in the U. S. Department of Agriculture. In addition, copies of the Research Program Committee's recommendations will be provided to the committee known as NEC-14, established by the Northeast State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors and comprised of department chairmen or their representatives. The NEC-14 Committee will be invited to give its reactions to the recommended program to the Northeast Station Directors.

Appendix B[1]



## Community Services Identification

Service Category

I. Physical Services--Definition: Services which influence, alter, and determine the physical and biological environment of a community.

A. Utilities

1. Water--Definition: Provision of water for home, community, and industrial uses; includes planning, construction, service rates, and collections.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Department of Finance, Planning, Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, Private Water Supply Companies, Special Authorities.

2. Power--Definition: Provision of electricity and gas for home, community, and industrial uses; includes planning, financing, constructing, servicing, rates, and collections.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Department of Planning, Public Utilities Commission, Private Energy Supply Companies

3. Sewage and Drainage--Definition: Activities relating to the planning, construction, financing, servicing, and charging for these services; includes regular sewers, storm sewers, and other special drainage projects.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Departments of Finance, Planning, and Public Health may have special districts and/or authorities

4. Communication--Definition: All matters relating to the provision of telephone service, community television.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Public Utilities Commission, Private Telephone Company, Cable TV, etc.

---

[1]This classification is adapted with minor modification from Inventory of Social Services for the Stockton Metropolitan Area by McCalla, Cauchois, and Hackett for the Center for Community Development, University of California, Davis, Extension, February 1970.

5. Solid Wastes--Definition: Includes provision of regular garbage pick-up, garden refuse collection, and miscellaneous other pick-ups of trash, refuse, etc.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Departments of Finance, Planning, Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, and Private Hauling Companies

B. Roads, Streets, and Frontage Improvements

1. Streets and Highways--Definition: All matters relating to planning, financing, constructing, and maintaining of roads, streets, curbs, bicycle paths, sidewalks, and other frontage improvements except lights and storm sewers.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Departments of Planning, Public Works, Streets or Roads, and State Department of Transportation.

2. Lighting--Definition: All matters relating to planning, financing, constructing, maintaining and servicing street lighting; organization of lighting districts, contractual arrangements, bonds, and collections.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Departments of Planning and Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, Private Electric Companies, and Special Lighting Districts.

3. Traffic Control--Definition: Planning, locating, installing, and servicing traffic lights, street names, traffic signs, parking zones and parking meters; determination of traffic patterns, long-range traffic control planning; enforcement of traffic regulations; municipal, county, and state.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Departments of Police, Public Works, Streets or Roads, County and State Police.

C. Housing

1. Zoning--Definition: Determination of land-use patterns; hearing procedures; determination of patterns of highest and best use; administration of general zoning procedures.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Planning Agencies.

2. Building Permits--Definition: The granting of construction permits and inspection to insure that building-code specifications are met for both new and remodeled residential and commercial construction.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Department of Building Safety and/or Public Works, Planning and Code Enforcement or Building Inspection.

3. Housing Inspection--Definition: Enforcement of the housing code; enforcement of minimum health and safety standards in existing residential buildings.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Department of Code Enforcement of Building Inspection, Fire Department, Local or County Health Department.

4. Public Housing--Definition: All matters relating to the planning, construction, maintenance, and operation of public housing facilities; leased housing programs, project development, etc., with special emphasis on housing for elderly and low income.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Planning Departments, Housing Authorities, State Departments of Welfare, Labor, Industry, and Health

5. Redevelopment--Definition: Matters relating to urban renewal as it affects residential housing and improvement in residential housing; environmental coordination with broader development in redevelopment projects.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Department of Finance, Planning, Public Works, Streets or Roads, Redevelopment Agency, Housing Authority, County and State Housing Agencies.

D. Other Physical Services

1. Landscaping--Definition: Planning, development, and maintenance of public areas such as medians, street margins, parks, etc.; essentially involves the contribution of landscaping to public developments.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Departments of Parks and Recreation, Planning, Public Works, Streets or Roads, and County and State Recreation Agencies.

2. Flood Control--Definition: Public and private planning, construction, and maintenance of program to control floods and excess water runoff; flood insurance.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Local Governing Body, Public Works Department, County and State Environmental Departments, U. S. Corps of Engineers.

3. Pest Control--Definition: Preliminary surveys, planning and action designed to regulate pest populations (insects, animals, birds).

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   County Public Works Department, Special Spray Districts, and SPCA.

II. Physical-People Services--Definition: Services which influence both the physical-biological environment of a community and the behavior patterns of individuals in the community are defined as joint physical and social services affecting the environment of the community.

   A. Public Safety

      1. Police--Definition: All activity designed to enforce the laws and protect people and property from illegal activities; does not include prosecution of violators, only apprehension; crime prevention, and crime control.

         Illustrative organizational arrangements.

         Department of Police, County District Attorney and Sheriff, State Police, and FBI.

      2. General Public Safety--Definition: General services relating to community and individual safety not assumed under specific categories; such things as civil defense, disaster control and relief; injurious environmental pollution of water, air, and soil; industrial safety; education campaigns for home, highway, and industrial safety; consumer and health protection.

         Illustrative organizational arrangements.

         County Offices of Civil Defense and Sheriff, Civil Defense Council of Agencies, Health Districts, Medical Societies, County Health and/or Welfare Councils, and Cooperative Extension Offices.

      3. Fire--Definition: Preventive services designed to reduce or eliminate conditions of fire hazard; public education on fire safety; fire control; and fire fighting.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Local Fire and Public Works Departments, Water Authorities, Special Fire Districts, Private Fire-Fighting Companies.

4. Courts--Definition: All elements of the criminal and civil justice systems; prosecution of alleged violation of municipal, city, state, and federal civil and criminal ordinances and codes.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Local Justices or Magistrates, County Small Claims and Superior Courts, District Attorney, Public Defender's Office, Non-profit Legal-Aid Organizations.

5. Correctional Programs for Adults--Definition: Programs for people detained regarding law violation; supervisory activities for individuals reentering society; rehabilitation programs both in and outside of custody, for example, parole, probation, work furlough.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   County Jails and Office of Parole, Public and Private Employment Services, Special Manpower Programs.

6. Correctional Programs--Youth--Definition: Programs for minors who have either violated the law or come from unhealthy family situations.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Public and Private Juvenile Homes, Youth Employment Services, School Districts, County Courts and District Attorney.

7. Legal Aid--Definition: All matters pertaining to legal advice and assistance to individuals, groups, or businesses involved with the three stages of the law and justice system: (1) protection and apprehension: (2) prosecution and (3) correctional and punitive; both private and publicly provided legal services.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Public Defender's Office, Non-profit Legal-Aid Organizations.

B. Planning

1. Development and Redevelopment--Definition: The planning, financing, and constructing of new public and private housing, industrial, and service developments, planning, finance and construction of redevelopment and renewal projects, with the exception of housing projects.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Municipal Department of Finance and Planning, Redevelopment, Authority, Housing Authority, County Department of Planning, Economic Development Associations or Councils, Chamber of Commerce.

2. Planning--Definition: All processes relating to planning; physical and social planning; project and long-run comprehensive planning.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Local Department of Finance and Planning, Housing Authority, Economic Development Council, County Planning and Public Works Departments.

C. Environmental and Other Regulation

1. Building Inspection--other than residential (factories, nursing homes, etc.

2. Land-Use Control--Definition: Enforcement of land-use codes (forest management, wild-life habitat, environmental protection)

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Agricultural Districts, Use-Value Assessments, Scenic Easements, Fee Simple Purchase.

3. Pollution control.

D. Parks and Recreation

1. Parks--Definition: All matters relating to planning, financing, acquiring, constructing, maintaining parks, park facilities, golf courses, and swimming pools; does not include programs carried on in parks and other facilities.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Local Department of Planning and Parks and Recreation, School District, County Planning and Parks and Recreation Departments.

2. General Recreation--Definition: Programs, activities, and facilities designed for general community participation at all age and economic levels.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Local Department of Parks and Recreation, Neighborhood or Community Recreation Centers, Housing Authority, Chamber of Commerce, Recreation Authority and/or Special District, Office of Aging.

3. Youth Recreation--Definition: Programs, activities, and facilities designed specifically to interest and occupy elementary and high school youth; emphasis on skill training and competition.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Local Department of Parks and Recreation, Scouts, Boys Club, Campfire Girls, Community Centers, Religious Centers, YMCA, YWCA.

E. Transportation--Definition: Includes provision of intracommunity public transportation; intercommunity transportation links, e.g., taxis; school-bus service; regulation of rates and service patterns.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Department of Streets or Roads, School Districts, Local Transportation Systems, Special Transportation Districts, Special Categorical Programs, (e.g., elderly-only systems). This category was further subdivided into:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Air Transportation | A. People | B. Goods |
| 2. | Land Transportation | A. People | B. Goods |
| 3. | Water Transportation | A. People | B. Goods |

III. People Services--Definition: Services which directly affect the individual in a nonphysical sense and therefore affect the social environment of the community members.

A. Information and Referral Services--Definition: Providing information to potential consumers about appropriate services available in the community and referral; it may include feedback to service providers and coordinators.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Local Department of Planning, MH-MR, I & R Office, Employment Office, Interagency Coordinating Committee, Health and Welfare Council, Council of Churches, Chamber of Commerce.

B. Health Care - Physical and Mental.

1. Preventive Health (physical and mental)--Definition: Programs aimed at maintaining health, e.g., nutritional programs, smoking clinics, diet programs, immunization, control of communicable diseases, environmental health (e.g., milk and food inspection), physical examinations, health education, special screening programs, counselling and referral activities of agencies which identify potential mental health problems.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

School Districts, County Health Departments, Cooperative Extension Service, Public Welfare Office; Special Screening, e.g., Cancer Society, Heart Association; Private Referral Services, e.g., Life Line, HELP.

2. Diagnostic, Treatment, and Out Patient Service--Definition: Services which diagnose and treat physical and mental illness.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Hospitals; Clinics: Private Dental, Medical, and Psychiatric Practioners; Group Practices; Public Health Nursing; Community Mental Health Programs; Dental Screenings and Follow-up Programs.

3. Acute Health Services--Definition: The physical provision of institutionalized treatment facilities for mental and physcial illnesses including emergency care.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Private and Public Hospitals, Ambulance Services, Non-Profit Associations Supporting Hospitals.

4. Chronic and Long-Term Care--Definition: Services for the chronically disabled.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Nursing Homes, Special Rehabilitation Centers, Home Care Alternatives, Other Long-Term Care (Old-Age Homes) Alternatives; Special Treatment and Care Facilities for Alcoholics, Mentally Ill, Mentally Retarded; and Half-Way Houses.

C. General Education Services

1. Pre-school--Definition: All programs, activities, and services of an educational nature designed for children before kindergarten age.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Health District, Family Service Agency, Private Nursery Schools, Programs like Head Start.

2. Elementary, Junior High, and High Schools--Definition: Institutionalized regular educational services, public and private, for children in the kindergarten through twelfth grade.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Consolidated and Contract School Districts.

3. Post High School Formalized Education--Definition: Two- and Four-Year Colleges.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Community College, Vocational-Technical\Trade Schools.

4. Adult and Continuing Education--Definition: All educational activities for people who are not regular participants in the formalized education activity; night classes, extension classes, courses for credit or noncredit; educational updating which will include education for purposes of citizenship training as well as vocational.

5. Library--Definition: All matters relating to the provision of library services.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Community and County Libraries, Community Action Council Pre-school Bookmobile, Housing Authority.

D. Special Educational Services

1. Special Education for Children--Definition: Educational activities for children requiring special attention; basically designed to provide educational opportunities for these children.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   MH-MR, School District, Easter Seals Society, Association for Retarded Children.

2. Special Education for Adults--Definition: Education for physically and mentally handicapped; education for the blind, deaf, and disabled; consumer and family management education, etc.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Department of Welfare or Assistance, Employment Office, School District, MH-MR, Chamber of Commerce.

E. Employment Services

1. Vocational Training and Retraining--Definition: Training for new entrants into the skilled and unskilled labor markets, training to update skills, training to learn additional skills of those already in the labor market, training, to facilitate re-entry into the labor market.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

State Employment Service, School Districts, Vocational-Technical Schools, Community Colleges, State Department of Special Programs, County and State Correctional Programs.

2. Vocational Rehabilitation--Definition: Retraining of people who have some physical, social, or mental disability; training for people whose old skills have become invalidated by disability.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   County and State Correctional Facilities, State Department of Labor Special Programs, School District, Vocational-Technical Schools, MH-MR.

3. Placement--Definition: Job location and matching; job referrals; special services devoted to the employment of hardcore minority groups.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Chamber of Commerce, State Employment Office, Workmen's Compensation Appeals Board, State Departments of Education and Labor Parole Office.

4. Testing and Counseling--Definition: Vocational counseling and aptitude testing for youth and adults.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   State Employment Offices, Chambers of Commerce, State Departments of Education and Labor, Parole Offices.

5. Job Development--Definition: Any effort devoted to the creation of employment opportunities for adults and youth: seeking of employment opportunities for hardcore unemployed and minority groups.

6. Regulation--Definition: Unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, equal employment, child labor, wages and hours,

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Economic Development Association, Chamber of Commerce, State Department of Commerce.

F. Social Services

1. Income Supplement--Definition: Those programs which provide cash or inkind resources to families or individuals, including public assistance, supplemental security income (SSI), medicaid, food stamps, donated foods, contributed emergency relief.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

Department of Social Service or Welfare, Social Security Administration, Workmens' Compensation Office, Red Cross, Veterans Administration, Department of Health.

2. Services to Aging--Definition: Those programs which attend to the physical, social, and educational and employment needs and interests of the elderly, including home help to maintain them in their own homes.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Senior Citizens, Golden Age Club of the Salvation Army, RSVP, Congregate Feeding or Meals-on-Wheels, Homemaker Services, Department of Social Services.

3. Services to Families and Adults-- Definition: Those programs which provide problem diagnoses, counseling and referral to individuals and families needing temporary or long-term assistance with problems of marital or parent-child relationships, financial management, home management, vocational and educational choices, crises adjustment, family planning.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Family Service Society, Department of Social Services, crises intervention centers, Mental Health Clinics, Employment Office, Planned Parenthood.

4. Children's Services--Definition: Programs which are directed toward the care, protection, nurturing, and [optimal] development (physical, intellectual, and social) of children from conception to adulthood, including adoption, foster home placement, day care, the prevention of neglect and abuse and counseling.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Child Welfare Association, Family Service Center, Department of Social Service, Day Care Council, School District, Children's homes. Children's Rights organization.

5. Services for the Handicapped--Definition: Programs directed toward the amelioration of physical, mental, and emotional handicaps both through intervention in the environment and education/training of the client.

   Illustrative organizational arrangements.

   Institute for the Rehabilitation of the Blind, Veterans Administration, Association for Retarded Children, Mental Health Association, Comprehensive Child Development Cooperatives, Muscular Dystrophy, Multiple Sclerosis.

G. Citizenship/Voting--Definition: Services to facilitate and encourage citizen participation in electoral matters.

Illustrative organizational arrangements.

League of Women Voters and other civic organizations, municipal and county governments.

Note: Churches were not included as a separate service although as institutions they do provide or assist others to provide many of the services listed above.

## Alternative Organizational Arrangements

Governmental organization is a complex subject involving such elements as the form of government, fiscal capabilities, functions performed, and specific powers. It includes how citizen inputs are registered, the combining of factors of production to produce public goods and services, and the evaluation of outcomes both in terms of cost and citizen satisfactions. Traditionally, research on organization has been viewed narrowly as involving the basic questions of form--i.e., commission form, executive form, etc. Quite obviously the area is much broader in content and result involving such research concerns as predictions of cost, quality, quantity and equity as a function of alternative structures. Also involved is the complex area of intergovernmental relations and consolidation. This includes questions relating to intergovernmental service agreements, transfer of functions, annexation, consolidation, and federation. Research in the area is further complicated by the fact that community services range on a continuum from public to private goods.

## Demand and Supply Relationships

Economic theory provides excellent criteria by which private goods can be efficiently allocated in a private, competitive market. Prices at which sales are made reflect production costs, the marginal value of resources incorporated into the product, and the marginal value of the product to the consumer. Price movements signal producers to increase or decrease their production or to divert resources from one good to another.

Such a competitive market situation is uncommon in the governmental sector. Governmental or public goods and services do not lend themselves to direct money price determination because of joint consumption problems, externalities, exclusion costs, and distributional or welfare considerations. However, the demand-supply concept is relevant enough--especially in view of the growth of the polycentric organizational viewpoint--that it will be briefly discussed. It has implications not only in terms of the efficiency concept but for the other assignment criteria, equity, political accountability, and administrative effectiveness, as well.

Demand - Estimation of the demand for government services is complex and circuitous. Fortunately, consumer demand signals can be identified for many services even though some are quite weak. The traditional individual preference approach is appropriate where strong price signals are available, e.g., a utility service for which user charges are imposed.

Voting behavior often must be studied because the chain of interactions between consumer and service producer is tenuous. This can involve the behavior of the electorate, legislators, pressure groups, and citizens "voting with their feet."

Political economists--especially of the public choice persuasion--have recently attempted to develop theoretical models in which political institutions are substituted for market process in efforts to link individual preferences to public expenditures.

Lastly, the benefit-cost approach can be applied to analyze the demand for governmental goods and services, regardless of how weak the demand signals are.

Supply - A governmental supply function relates service costs to output. Unfortunately, in the public sector the supply concept has as many or more conceptual problems as the demand concept. Governments appear to pursue a variety of goals, many of them conflicting, thus often rendering marginal cost optimality inapplicable. There is no assurance that the least cost solution will be selected. Also, governments operate in monopolistic markets thus causing their marginal cost curves not to be their supply curves.

Once again alternative formulations of supply must be derived. These include observing alternative qualitives of services subject to a budget constraint, determining which governments should supply a service, and how well different groups of people (income classes, etc.) are and should be supplied. Distribution rules include input equality, output equality, and resource allocation efficiency.

Linkages - One of the most important considerations in studying the demand and supply of governmental services is that of analyzing the various actual and potential demand-supply linkages between different governmental structures. For example, control units have the actual legal responsibility to provide the service in question. Producer units actually produce the service under consideration. Several producer units may comprise one control unit. Still other units may contract to purchase the service in question.

Various alternative organizational structures may arise from the situation surrounding a given service in a particular locality. For example, a school district (control unit), with ten elementary schools (producer units), four junior highs (producer units), and two high schools (producer units) is one alternative structure. Another alternative organizational structure would be two school districts with an appropriate number of elementary, junior high, and high schools. Other examples might include a township with a separate fire department and ambulance service versus combined services; or the township (control unit) could contract with a nearby city (producer unit) to provide fire protection and producing its own ambulance service.

These alternative organizational structures would then cover the wide range of means of providing community services from local monopolies through interlocal cooperation and joint provision of services and contracting with private producers to a large scale integration of the means of providing a single service or group of services. Demand and supply considerations permeate this entire milieu. How they are resolved in an organizational sense has a profound effect upon the outcomes (products) and hence consumer (voter) satisfactions with the system.

## Alternative Models of Governmental Organization

Various theorists have developed different governmental models for organization and service assignment. They vary in the degree that they advocate centralization or decentralization of functions, powers, and activities among local and regional governments. Basically, there are three distinct choices. One school favors a consolidated form of government for both local and area-

wide services. Another favors a two-tier federation with a formal division of responsibilities between areawide and local units. Still another school favors a decentralized or polycentric approach to functional assignment.

Consolidation - Consolidationists argue that intergovernmental unification will produce (1) economy in government, (2) greater public service integration and coordination, (3) greater popular control over public service delivery, and (4) more efficient administration and equitable financing of public services. They contend that governmental fragmentation is at the heart of metropolitan service problems since local governments will not always cooperate and since fragmentation creates excessive variations in local capabilities.

Where governmental consolidation has occurred, the quantity and quality of some public services has improved and services have been expanded into fringe areas. Service duplication has been eliminated and somewhat greater fiscal equity in financing also has occurred. However, consolidations are still beset with vexing political problems--representation remains a source of conflict, pressures for service decentralization persist, and minority groups feel that their interests have suffered.

Federation - Some advocate a formal, two-tier system of functional assignment. This involves the creation of a general purpose, areawide government which performs functions solely for and in conjunction with lower-tier units. Proponents of federation say that unsystematic assignment of functional responsibilities will frequently produce too little centralization of areawide functions, sometimes overcentralization of local ones, and too little coordination of both. They desire the establishment of an areawide unit that determines priorities among regional functions, mediates interlocal functional conflict, and coordinates local decision making.

Limited experience with two-tier government shows that areawide units have assumed a number of areawide functions and increased and standardized the scope of other public services. Interlocal functional conflicts have not always been mediated by the areawide units, however. This failure has led the States either to intervene or rely on other regional bodies for the performance of areawide functions. Two-tier arrangements also do not always result in the establishment of a general purpose areawide unit but sometimes one which has merely budgetary and areawide controls over other areawide bodies.

Polycentricity - Polycentrists favor an ad hoc bargained approach to assigning urban services. They agree that any areawide tier of government should have few pre-ordained or formally defined functional responsiblities. This allows most functions to be performed by lower-tier governments directly by contract with other, larger units of government. In this way, citizens will receive only those services they desire from lower- and upper-tier governments. Thus, polycentrists generally favor a fragmented metropolitan governance set-up with largescale, upper-tier governments performing only those services that are bid for by local governments and lower-tier governments providing all other services.

The polycentric approach is basically a market model for organizing and allocating functions to different levels of government.

Most areas exhibit a somewhat polycentric form of functional allocation. The alleged virtues of the polycentric system are: (1) its protection of jurisdictional and individual independence in the performance of urban functions; (2) its responsiveness to the diverse public goods demand of a community; (3) its emphasis on bargained and cooperative coordination of functional activity; (4) its creation of an open system of multiple access to areawide and local jurisdictions; and (5) its emphasis on experimentation and incremental progress towards areawide governance.

Problems with this system include the fact that citizens cannot always move to communities where they would like to live. Cooperation tends to occur most frequently among homogenous jurisdictions and only in selected, noncontroversial functions. Moreover, special district accountability is not always apparent. Thus, polycentrism does little to ease interlocal functional conflict. Indeed, it may allow such conflict to become institutionalized and place pressure on higher units of government to resolve such conflict. Also, it does not always heighten citizen choice or provide accountability.

Theory and practice - The above models offer a systematic guide to designing functional assignment and organizational systems. However, most frequently less drastic procedural and structural adaptations are adapted. The A-95 process (based on Budget Bureau Circular A-95 dated July 1969) has made an impact by expanding the level of interlocal information about local activities and made State and Federal governments more aware of the impact of their grant policies.

Intergovernmental service agreements are important modifications in organization and functional assignment. These are made with a variety of providers, deal with a wide range of items, and are made both on an areawide and local basis. Transfers and consolidation of functions are another way of changing functional assignments, but they are generally less widely practiced than intergovernmental service agreements.

It is the contention of this committee that many of the issues raised by the Consolidationists, Federationists and Polycentrists are both researchable and relevant issues with respect to community services. Hence the body of this report gives considerable attention to the study of alternative organizational arrangements for the delivery of community services.

Suggested Readings

Efficiency

Buchanan, James M. and Richard E. Wagner
"An Efficiency Basis for Federal Fiscal Equalization," in the Analysis of Public Output, edited by Julius Margolis. New York; National Bureau of Economic Research, 1970, pp. 139-158.

California Council on Intergovernmental Relations
Economies-of-Scale Analysis in State and Local Government, by D. J. Alesch and L. A. Dougharty. Rand Corp. Proj. No. R-739-CIR. Santa Monica; Rand, 1971.

Fisher, G. H.
"Cost Functions and Budgets: Cost Considerations in Systems Analysis," in The Analysis of Public Output, edited by Julius Margolis. New York; National Bureau of Economic Research, 1970, pp. 231-263.

Golladay, Fredrick L., Marilyn E. Manser, and Kenneth R. Smith
"Scale Economies in the Delivery of Medical Care: A Mixed Integer Programming Analysis of Efficient Manpower Utilization," in the Journal of Human Resources 9, no. 1, Winter 1974, pp. 50-62.

Hatry, Harry P., and Donald M. Fisk
"Improving Productivity and Product vity Measurement in Local Governments," Washington, D. C., National Commission on Productivity, 1971.

Hirsch, Werner Z.
"Quality of Government Services," in Public Expenditure Decisions in the Urban Economy, edited by Howard G. Schaller, Resources For the Future, Inc., 1962, pp. 163-179.

_____
"Cost Functions of an Urban Government Service: Refuse Collection," in Review of Economics and Statistics 47, Feb. 1965, pp. 87-92.

_____
The Economics of State and Local Governments. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1970, pp. 49-82, 167-184.

Hufschmidt, Raymond M., and Jacques Gerin.
"Systematic Errors in Cost Estimates for Public Investment Projects," in The Analysis of Public Output, edited by Julius Margolis. New York, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1970, pp. 267-316.

Rothenberg, Jerome
"Local Decentralization and the Theory of Optimal Government," in The Analysis of Public Output, edited by Julius Margolis. New York, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1970, pp. 31-64.

Stocks, Anthony H.
"Consideration of Scale in Providing State and Local Public Goods," in West Virginia University Business and Economic Studies Vol. 11, no. 1. Morgantown, West Virginia University, 1968.

U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations
Government Functions and Processes: Local and Areawide, Vol. 4. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1974, pp. 82-87, 126-128.

Wildavsky, Aaron
"The Political Economy of Efficiency," in Public Administration Review 26, Dec. 1966, pp. 292-310.

Effectiveness

Arrow, Kenneth J.
"Political and Economic Evaluation of Social Effects and Externalities," in The Analysis of Public Output, edited by Julius Margolis. New York, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1970, pp. 1-23.

Bish, Robert L.
The Public Economy of Metropolitan Areas. Chicago, Rand McNally, 1973, pp. 18-62.

Burkhead, Jesse and Jerry Miner
Public Expenditure. New York, Aldine and Atherton, 1971, pp. 206-251.

Downs, Anthony
"Uncompensated Non-Construction Costs Which Urban Highways and Urban Renewal Impose Upon Residential Households," in The Analysis of Public Output, edited by Julius Margolis. New York, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1970, pp. 69-106.

Hirsch, Werner Z.
The Economics of State and Local Government. New York, McGraw-Hill Co., 1970, pp. 147-166, 216-254.

McKean, Roland N.
Efficiency in Government Through Systems Analysis. New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Mishan, E. J.
Cost-Benefit Analysis. New York, Praeger Publishers, 1971.

Oates, Wallace E.
Fiscal Federalism. New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972, pp. 31-64.

The Urban Institute and International City Management Association
Measuring the Effectiveness of Basic Municipal Services, Initial Report. Washington, D.C., International City Management Association, 1974.

Vickrey, William
"Externalities in Public Facility Use: The Case of Highway Accidents," in The Analysis of Public Output, edited by Julius Margolis. New York, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1970, pp. 317-335.

Williamson, Oliver
"Administrative Decision Making and Pricing: Externality and Compensation Analysis Applied" in the Analysis of Public Output, edited by Julius Margolis. New York, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1970, pp. 115-135.

Equity

Bish, Robert L.
The Public Economy of Metropolitan Areas. Chicago, Rand McNally, 1973, pp. 35-62.

Hirsch, Werner Z.
The Economics of State and Local Government. New York, McGraw Hill Company, 1970, pp. 185-198.

Landau, Martin
"Redundance, Rationality, and the Problem of Duplication and Overlap," in Public Administration Review 29, July-Aug. 1969, pp. 346-358.

Murphy, Thomas P. and Patricia S. Florestano
The Allocation of Local and Areawide Functions in Metropolitan Areas. Washington, D.C., National Academy of Public Administration, 1973.

Olson, Mancur, Jr.
"The Principle of Fiscal Equivalence," in American Economic Review 59, no. 2, May 1969, pp. 482-485.

Phares, Donald
State-Local Tax Equity. New York, D. C. Heath and Company, 1973.

Shoup, Donald and Arthur Rosett
"Fiscal Exploitation by Overlapping Governments," in Fiscal Pressure on the Central City, edited by Werner Hirsch and others. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971, pp. 239-301.

U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations
Government Functions and Processes: Local and Areawide, Vol. 4. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1974, pp. 87-89, 128-131.

Systemic Adaptability

Break, George F.
"Changing Roles of Different Levels of Government," in The Analysis of Public Output, edited by Julius Margolis. New York, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1970, pp. 163-209.

Brinkerhoff, M. C. and P. R. Kunz
"Organizational and Environmental Interaction," in Complex Organizations and Their Environments. Dubuque, Iowa, Brown, 1972, pp. 245-304.

Demone, H. W., and D. Harshbarger
"Perspectives for the Future," A Handbook of Human Service Organizations. New York, Behavioral Publications, 1974, pp. 475-571.

Etzioni, A.
The Active Society. New York, Free Press, 1968.

Hasenfeld, Y. and P. A. English, eds.
"Organizational Innovation and Change," Human Service Organizations. Ann Arbor, Mich., University of Michigan Press, 1974, pp. 680-742.

Leach, Richard H., ed.
"Intergovernmental Relations in America Today," in The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 416, Nov. 1974. Philadelphia, The Annals, 1974, pp. 1-193.

Michael, D. N.
On Learning to Plan--and Planning to Learn. San Francisco, Jossey Bass, 1973.

Schon, D.
Beyond the Stable State. New York, Norton, 1973.

Sundquist, James L.
Making Federalism Work. Washington, D. C., The Brookings Institution, 1969.

Zaltman, G., R. Duncan, and J. Holbek
Innovations and Organizations. New York, Wiley, 1973.

Citizen Satisfaction

Bish, Robert L.
The Public Economy of Metropolitan Areas. Chicago, Rand McNally Company, 1973, pp. 35-62.

_____ and Vincent Ostrom
Understanding Urban Government: Metropolitan Reformed Considered. Washington, D.C., American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1973.

Breton, Albert
The Economic Theory of Representative Government. Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company, 1974.

Campbell, Donald T.
"Reforms as Experiments," in American Psychologist 24, no. 4, Apr. 1969, pp. 409-429.

Demone, Harold N., Jr. and Dwight Harshbarger
"Issues in the Management and Planning of a Human Services Organization" in A Handbook of Human Services Organizations, edited by Demone and Harshbarger. New York, Behavioral Publications, 1974, pp. 3-21.

Hirschman, Albert O.
Exit, Voice and Loyalty. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1970.

Niskanen, William A., Jr.
Bureaucracy and Representative Government. Chicago, Aldine and Atherton, 1971.

Olson, Mancur
"Economics, Sociology and the Best of All Possible Worlds," The Public Interest, no. 12, Summer 1968, pp. 96-118.

_____
The Logic of Collective Action. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1965.

Ostrom, Elinor and others
Community Organization and the Provision of Public Service. Bloomington, Indiana University, 1971.

Rowen, Henry S.
"Assessing the Role of Systematic Decision Making in the Public Sector," in The Analysis of Public Output, edited by Julius Margolis. New York, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1970, pp. 219-227.

Needs

Baumheier, E. C., and G. A. Hellar
Analysis and Synthesis of Needs Assessment Research in the Field of Human Services. Denver, Colo., Center for Social Research and Development, 1974.

Bradshaw, Jonathan
"The Concept of Social Need," in Ekistics 220, Mar. 1974, pp. 184-187.

Bredemeier, H. C. and Toby, Jr.
Social Problems in America. New York, Wiley, 1966.

Douglas, Jack
Defining America's Social Problems. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Galper, Jeffry
The Politics of Social Services. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Gooler, D., and others
Rhetoric and Practice: Needs Assessment in a Major Development Efforts, Working Paper No. 5. Lincoln, Neb., Office of Research and Evaluation, University of Mid-America, 1975.

Lazar, I.
"Long-Range Planning for Children's Services." Speech delivered to the Regional Workshops, Education Commission of the States, 1975.

Evaluation

Adams, Stuart.
Evaluative Research in Corrections: A Practical Guide. Washington, D.C., Department of Justice, 1975.

American Institutes for Research.
Evaluative Research: Strategies and Methods. Air (Pittsburgh), 1970.

Caro, Francis, ed.
Readings in Evaluation Research. New York, Russell Sage, 1971.

Farmer, James, and George Papagiannis
Program Evaluation: Functional Education for Family Life Planning, III. New York, World Education, 1975.

Phi Delta Kappa.
Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Itasca, Ill. Peacock, 1971.

Rivlin, Alice
Systemic Thinking for Social Action. Washington, D.C., The Brookings Institution, 1971.

Rossi, Peter, and Walter Williams, eds.
Evaluating Social Programs: Theory, Practice, and Politics. New York, Seminar Press, 1972.

Scriven, Michael
"Prose and Cons about Goal-Free Evaluation", in Evaluation Comment, UCLA: Center for the Study of Evaluation no. 4, 1972.

Stake, Robert
"Objectives, Priorities, and Other Judgment Data," in Review of Educational Research 40, no. 2, 1970, pp. 181-212.

Steele, Sara
"Program Evaluation as an Administrative Concept," paper presented at AERA Annual Meeting, New Orleans, 1973.

Suchman, Edward
Evaluative Research: Principles and Practice in Public Service and Action Programs. New York, Russell Sage, 1967.

Weiss, Carol, ed.
Evaluating Action Programs: Readings in Social Action and Education. Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

_____
Evaluation Research: Methods of Assessing Program Effectiveness. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1972.

# PUBLICATIONS OF THE NORTHEAST REGIONAL CENTER FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

*Working Papers on Rural Community Services: National Workshop on Problems of Research on Delivery of Community Services in Rural Areas, December 13-16, 1971.* Compiled by S. M. Leadley. (Published by the Northeast, the North Central, and the Western Regional Centers, the Southeast Regional Rural Development Research Center at Tuskegee Institute, and the Southern Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors)

*Papers of the Workshop on Current Rural Development Regional Research in the Northeast, July 25-28, 1972*

*Publication*

1. *Supplement to Task Force Report on Rural Development Research in the Northeast For the Next Five Years — A Framework.* August 1973.
2. *Community Resource Development: A Preliminary Bibliography of Extension-Related Material in the Northeast.* December 1973.
3. *An Inventory of Pilot Projects in Community and Rural Development: Cooperative Extension Programs in the Northeast* (forthcoming).
4. *Papers — Workshop on Evaluating State Title V Pilot Programs in the Northeast, October 29-31, 1974.* January 1975. One dollar per copy.
5. *The Proceedings of the Conference on Rural Land-Use Policy in the Northeast,* October 2-4, 1974. February 1975. Three dollars per copy.
6. *A Basic Introduction to Land Use Control Law and Doctrine.* By E. F. Roberts. March 1975. One dollar per copy.
7. *State Land-Use Laws in the Northeast: A Compendium and Classification of Selected Statutes.* By Leslie C. Hyde. April 1975. One dollar per copy.
8. *Evaluating Impacts of Economic Growth Proposals: An Analytical Framework for Use With Community Decision-Makers.* April 1975. Two dollars per copy.
9. *Report on the Property Research Workshop,* June 25-28, 1975. Prepared by Dale Colyer, West Virginia University. January 1976.

Programs of the Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development are available without regard to race, color, religion, sex or national origin.

1/76 700